

## **FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

### **HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE September 7, 2005 Portland, OR**

#### **Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Welcome and Introductions .....	1
HAB Static Display.....	1
Outreach Efforts.....	2
Public Involvement Discussion.....	3
University of Washington .....	4
Committee Business.....	5
Handouts .....	6
Attendees.....	6

*This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.*

#### **Welcome and Introductions**

Norma Jean Germond, chair, led the meeting. The June 2005 meeting summary was adopted.

#### **HAB Static Display**

The Public Involvement Committee's (PIC) goals are to find ways to reach a more diverse audience and better engage stakeholders. Susan Leckband developed and has been using a display of Hanford Advisory Board (Board) materials at site tours. The Committee would like to develop a similar static display to be placed in the lobby during Board meetings. The display board would provide passersby with general information about the Board and its role at Hanford. The display board would consist mostly of static materials that would not need to be updated regularly; however, it could also include meeting specific material, such as the agenda. Committee members would design the display board and compile the appropriate materials with the assistance of the Tri Party Agreement (TPA) agencies. Greg de Bruler suggested including pictures on the display board to help draw the attention of passersby. The committee agreed to suggest adding the development of the display board to the list of 2006 Board Priorities for discussion at the next Board meeting. Once it is approved as part of the Board Priorities, the committee will further discuss content and development.

## **Outreach Efforts**

The committee discussed different avenues and opportunities for extending Board and individual Board member outreach to the public. Some of the ideas discussed were a speaker's bureau, interviews with local editorial boards, and strategic Executive Committee outreach to editorial boards in conjunction with Hanford public meetings and Board meetings.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Jim Trombold would like to see the committee thinking more creatively about how to engage the public. He does not think the public meetings, like Yakima, work well because the public is not eager to give up their evening plans. He suggested taking advantage of groups that hold regular meetings and may be looking for topics to discuss. A good way to do this would be to have a list of Board members willing to speak at these meetings. Using the Oregon Department of Energy's (DOE) video would provide the speaker with material to use during their presentation. Norma Jean agreed Oregon DOE has relevant and up-to-date materials that could be used by Board members to give effective presentations.
- Greg de Bruler suggested putting more effort into getting the public to the State of the Site meetings and End States meetings as those meetings have the potential to be more interesting for members of the public. He does not think the majority of the general public would be engaged at a Board meeting.
- Norma Jean mentioned environmental justice and ensuring that under-reached populations are included in the Board's outreach.
- Helen Wheatley noted it might be hard for Board members to be clear where the boundaries are between speaking as a Board member and speaking as a member of their constituency. She would like to see the speaker's clearinghouse include each speaker's constituency and their ideology. This would prevent the speakers from being constrained by the Board's perspective and might encourage those who would be worried about speaking strictly for the Board to participate. Norma Jean concurred, stating that restricting someone to speak only from the Board's perspective requires the speaker to be too deeply enmeshed in the Board's culture. Jim stated that normally the organizations requesting these meetings are simply looking for general information about Hanford and what is happening at Hanford. The common goal for the Board, agencies and regulators is Tri Party cleanup. Speakers should not be speaking from a biased position, but rather simply informing groups about Hanford and Hanford cleanup. Norma Jean also noted the speaker should be looking for the publics' values and ensuring they are reaching out to the captive audience who may know nothing about Hanford.
- Greg would like to see the speaker's list posted on the Board's website where organizations could request specific constituencies and speakers. The speaker could

take the Board's advice and speak to it if needed. He thinks this type of speaker's clearinghouse would better engage all Board members and their constituencies.

- Todd asked if the purpose of the speaker's clearinghouse would be to promote the Board and educate the public or to promote constituencies and their agendas. Greg responded his goal isn't to increase public participation for the Board, but rather to increase public involvement and awareness of Hanford cleanup. Offering access to constituencies with expertise, through Board and agency websites, would increase public awareness and participation.
- Harold Heacock stated he likes the idea of using the web for self-advertising. It will help utilize resources more efficiently. He would like to see all interested Board members be allowed to participate. Having standard presentation materials regarding Hanford, cleanup and the Board's role should make it easy for Board members to participate.
- Gerry Pollett suggested having the Board's Executive Committee, or their designated representative, approach editorial boards prior to meetings. They could discuss the upcoming meeting and the items of interest. It would help with publicity and make the public more aware of what is happening. Jim agreed and stated the Board could do a better job of connecting with the local newspapers, too.
- Greg noted there are a number of big decisions coming up that will require public involvement. He would like to see the agencies consider past involvement when determining where to hold meetings. He noted that, in the past, Hood River has had very good attendance at the two to three meetings that were held there each year. This year there was only one meeting held in Hood River. Greg would like PIC to be more involved in helping the agencies develop their public involvement plans and programs.
- Gerry would like to see PIC work to generate public involvement in the upcoming decisions, rather than focusing on the work of the Board.
- Todd reminded the committee that, during June's meeting, they had agreed that public meetings are not necessarily the best way to engage the community.

### **Public Involvement Discussion**

Helen discussed the Hanford Advisory Board White Paper on Public Involvement, developed by the Board in November 2001. She asked the committee to review the white paper and compare it to the community relations plan, and the PIC committee's missions/planning table from 2002. She suggested the committee use these documents as a starting point when developing their focus for 2006.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Norma Jean noted the white paper eludes to how the Board should engage the public and what attitudes the Board and agencies should have regarding public involvement. The community relations plan details materials to be prepared and available to the public, however most of these materials are not currently available. Helen suggested the committee review these documents and start asking if the community relations plan is currently being implemented and fulfilled.
- Greg would like to see the PIC use the white paper to guide discussions with the agencies and regulators regarding public involvement for the upcoming decisions. He suggested starting with the upcoming Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) 5-year Review. He would like the committee, agencies and regulators to sit down in a half-day meeting to work out a meeting plan and begin to craft the public involvement plan.
- The committee recommended that the agencies convene a planning and discussion group, inviting the committee and other key stakeholders, to discuss public involvement in the CERCLA 5-year Review and similar decisions.
- Joe Voice, DOE-RL, noted there may be limitations to what the committee could contribute to the CERCLA 5-year Review. He suggested the agencies may contact Greg, or other interested individuals, directly to request input.

#### **Regulator Perspective**

- Dennis Faulk noted that the committee has assisted with the planning and strategy for public involvement and meetings many times in the past. He stated the Tri Party Agreement (TPA) Quarterly meeting used to run-over into the PIC meeting, which provided excellent opportunities for collaboration. This hasn't happened in the last year and may be part of the reason the committee isn't as satisfied with recent meetings. He would like to see these types of collaborative discussions reinstated so that the committee and agencies can all re-engage.
- Nolan Curtis said that, while he thinks a planning and discussion group could be useful, he would like to ensure that the meeting would consist of constructive dialog, with all parties listening and not critiquing or finger pointing. Dennis agreed, stating he would like to see a more process-oriented discussion. He thinks the process may be breaking down, which is contributing to the current issues.

#### **University of Washington**

The November Board meeting will be held at the University Tower Inn, which is very close to the University of Washington (UW). PIC would like to have targeted outreach to UW professors and students.

#### **Committee Discussion**

- Jeanie Sedgely said she was thinking of having a sort of panel discussion/forum with Todd giving a brief presentation about the Board. She also knows a UW professor who is familiar with worker issues who would be great to have on the panel. Gerry

stated that there are quite a few people at the UW with expertise in areas relating to Hanford. He suggested having time set aside during November's Board meeting to hear from professors and graduate students who have done work in areas specific to Hanford. They could speak on anything from tank closure to worker health and safety or the river corridor. They could each do presentations and then answer questions in a panel format afterwards. This is a great opportunity for Board members to interact with people who have done technical analysis and are familiar with Hanford.

- The committee discussed having the UW expert panel in the evening, however there will be a State of the Site meeting on Wednesday evening before the Board meeting. The committee decided the panel may be too technical for the general public and would be better utilized if presented during the Board meeting.
- Gerry suggested making sure the experts are knowledgeable about topics of concern, possibly items from the 2006 Board Priorities.
- Committee members expressed keen interest in doing special outreach to UW students. Dennis suggested doing outreach to students for the State of the Site meeting. Committee members asked that the meeting format be modified to be more interesting for students. Having the expert panel during the Board meeting will also build in some publicity for the State of the Site.
- The committee agreed to assist the agencies in make the November State of the Site meeting more appealing using a previous, successful meeting as a starting point for the discussion.

### **Committee Business**

Issue Managers resulting from this meeting:

Susan Leckband – static display board

Greg de Bruler – speaker's clearinghouse

Gerry Pollett – UW expert panel coordination

Jeanie Sedgely – State of the Site and related student outreach

The next committee call will be on September 22<sup>nd</sup> at 11:30 AM.

## **Handouts**

- Agenda
  - Email from Helen Wheatley to Norma Jean Germond
  - Draft HAB PIC mission/planning table, September 17, 2002
  - Hanford Advisory Board Draft White Paper on Public Involvement, version 7, November 12, 2001
- 

## **Attendees**

### **HAB Members and Alternates**

Greg de Bruler	Jerri Main	Jeanie Sedgely
Norma Jean Germond	Todd Martin	Jim Trombold
Lynda Horst	Wanda Munn	Charlie Weems
Susan Leckband	Gerry Pollett	

### **Others**

Steve Chalk, DOE-RL	Nolan Curtis, Ecology	Lynette Bennett, WA Closure
Karen Lutz, DOE-RL	Tim Hill, Ecology	Sharon Braswell, Nuvotec
Joe Voice, DOE-RL	Tanya Williams, Ecology	Kelly Brazil, Innovations
Erik Olds, DOE-ORP	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Rebecca Sayne, HOA-NW
		Stacey Howery, EnviroIssues
Shannon Cram, Public	Barb Wise, Fluor Hanford	Penny Mabie, EnviroIssues